

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated January 13, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner indicated that claims 11 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 11 and 12 include patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 6-16, and 19 have been amended. Independent claims 1, 13, and 16 have been amended to clarify that a translucent layer fills a space between a skin and a transformer. Claims 2, 6-12, 14, 15, and 19 have been amended for antecedent basis purposes and claim 15 has also been amended to correct an error. No new matter has been added. Additionally, Applicant has canceled claims 4-5, 18, and 20. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 6-17, and 19 are in condition for allowance.

### **A. Statement of the Substance of the Interview Conducted December 16, 2004**

Participants of the interview included Examiner Ngo and Applicant's representative Lisa Schoedel. No exhibits were shown nor demonstrations conducted. The participants discussed claim 1 as well as U.S. Patent Nos. 4,791,290 and 5,936,842. Examiner Ngo indicated that an amendment to claim 1 would be necessary to overcome references that include both a translucent cover and a transformer. Examiner Ngo recommended an amendment to further define the cover. As a result of the interview, no agreement with respect to the claims was reached.

### **B. Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections**

Claims 1-10, 13-15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,791,290 ("Noone"). Claims 4, 5, and 20 have been canceled, so the rejection of

claims 4, 5, and 20 is moot. In amended claim 1, Applicant recites an electrical assembly that includes a transformer and a translucent electrically insulating skin surrounding the transformer. The skin includes a translucent shell and a translucent layer. The translucent layer displaces air and fills a clearance between the shell and the transformer. Similarly, in amended claim 13, Applicant recites a method of forming an electric assembly. The method includes placing the transformer in the translucent shell and filling a clearance between the transformer and the shell with a translucent filling material to displace air inside the shell.

In contrast, Noone describes a street light having “a translucent conical cover 41 through which light passes to the photoelectric sensor on the printed circuit board 2.” (Noone, column 5, lines 13-15.) Noone also describes a controller for a photoelectric control unit, which includes a transformer. (See, e.g., Noone, Fig. 9.) However, Noone is silent with respect to whether the transformer is encapsulated. Specifically, Noone does not show or suggest that the transformer is surrounded by a translucent electrically insulating skin. Moreover, Noone does not show or suggest that a translucent layer displaces air and fills a clearance between the shell and the transformer. At most, Noone teaches a transformer mounted on a printed circuit board.

Because Noone does not show or suggest a translucent electrically insulating skin surrounding the transformer, or a translucent layer displacing air and filling a clearance between the shell and the transformer; Noone does not show or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 13. Thus, Applicant submits that Noone does not anticipate claims 1 and 13. Claims 2, 3, and 6-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant also submits that Noone does not anticipate claims 2, 3, 6-10, and 14-15 for at least the reasons described above with reference to claims 1 and 13.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**C. Response to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

Claims 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious in light of Noone and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 18 has been canceled, so the rejection of claim 18 is moot. In amended claim 16, Applicant recites an electrical assembly. The assembly includes a cover encapsulating a transformer. The cover has a shape that is substantially the same as the transformer. A translucent material fills the space between the cover and the transformer.

As described above, Noone does not show or suggest a skin surrounding the transformer or a translucent layer displacing air and filling a clearance between the shell and the transformer. The Office Action states that one skilled in the art would have employed a specific shape. (Office Action, page 3.) However, this teaching of the knowledge of one skilled in the art fails to overcome the deficiencies of Noone. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 16 is not obvious in light of the combination of Noone and the cited knowledge of one skilled in the art.


Claims 17 and 19 depend from claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant also submits that claims 17 and 19 are not obvious in light of the combination of Noone and the cited knowledge of one skilled in the art for at least the reasons described above with reference to claim 16.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notice to this effect. Further, Applicant believes that the amendments do not raise new issues that require additional consideration and/or search as the amendments are based on limitations found in canceled claims 4, 5, 18, and 20. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative below if any questions arise or she may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa M. Schoedel  
Reg. No. 53,564  
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6709  
312 935 2362  
schoedel@mbhb.com

Dated: May 13, 2005